

VZCZCXYZ0000  
PP RUEHWEB

DE RUEHVEN #0142/01 1491712  
ZNY CCCCC ZZH  
P 281712Z MAY 08  
FM USMISSION USOSCE  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 5748  
INFO RUCNCFE/CONVENTIONAL ARMED FORCES IN EUROPE PRIORITY  
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO PRIORITY 1669  
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUEKDIA/DIA WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUESDT/DTRA-OSSES DARMSTADT GE PRIORITY  
RHMFISS/CDR USEUCOM VAIHINGEN GE PRIORITY  
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC//J5-DDPMA-IN/CAC/DDPMA-E// PRIORITY  
RUEAHQA/HQ USAF WASHINGTON DC//XONP// PRIORITY  
RUEADWD/DA WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY  
RUEASWA/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC//OSAE PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L USOSCE 000142

SIPDIS

STATE FOR VCI/CCA, EUR/RPM  
NSC FOR DOWLEY  
JCS FOR J5/COL NORWOOD  
OSD FOR ISA (PERENYI)

E.O. 12958: DECL: 05/27/2018  
TAGS: [KCFE](#) [OSCE](#) [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [RS](#)  
SUBJECT: CFE: MAY 27 JCG PLENARY: ALLIES CONFIRM NAC  
COMMITMENTS; BELGIUM/HUNGARY REFUSED INSPECTIONS

Classified By: Chief Arms Control Delegate Hugh Neighbour,  
for reasons 1.4(b) and (d).

¶1. (SBU) Summary: At the May 27 JCG Plenary, Russia asked JCG delegations from NATO to confirm the Alliance's current position on the 8 December 1998 NAC Statement on CFE, as well as the NATO-Russia Founding Act. Germany, the U.S., the U.K., the Netherlands, and the Czech Republic told Russia that Allies continue to support commitments contained therein, that they had not been superseded nor renounced. The U.S. also noted the NAC Statement was reaffirmed in PP9 of the CFE Final Act, observed that Allies continue to respect their CFE Final Act commitments, and urged Russia to respect its commitments, including regarding host nation consent. Other delegations stressed that the NAC Statement on 28 March 2008 contains the key for resolution of the ongoing CFE impasse. In addition, Hungary and Belgium announced recent rejections by Russia of their requests to conduct CFE inspections. The U.S. supported these Allies and reminded Russia that its "suspension" had no legal basis and urged it to resume Treaty implementation.

¶2. (C) At the JCG-T plus 4, some Allies expressed frustration at the slow pace of activities in the JCG. Luxembourg said it plans to urge the June 24 HLTF to allow the JCG to negotiate technical aspects of the definition of "substantial combat forces." End Summary.

- - - - -  
ALLIANCE COMMITMENTS ARE UNCHANGED  
- - - - -

¶3. (C) The JCG (Joint Consultative Group) met on May 27 under Italy's Chairmanship. As promised in the last meeting, Russia (Ulyanov) asked JCG delegations from NATO to reaffirm the Alliance's position on the 8 December 1998 NAC Statement on CFE, as well as the NATO-Russia Founding Act; specifically related to deployment of substantial combat forces. Russia is seeking confirmation because it believed one delegation would like to revise an element of the statement. (Note: during last week's meeting, Germany (Richter) immediately reaffirmed this statement, but other Allies were silent. Russia (Ulyanov) said that Moscow had reasons to believe that at least one State Party no longer supported these

commitments. End Note).

¶4. (SBU) Germany (Richter) responded by quoting passages from three NATO declarations; the 14 March 1997 NAC Statement, the 8 December 1998 NAC Statement on CFE, and the NATO-Russia Founding Act. In quoting the various passages, Richter told Russia that the three documents are interlinked and are related to each other. He said the documents remained valid and that each contained substance that would help resolve the current CFE crisis. He specifically quoted paragraphs 9, and 10 in the 8 December 1998 statement that refer to "...substantial ground or air combat forces..."

¶5. (SBU) The U.S. (Neighbour) reassured Russia that the commitments contained in the three statements have never been superseded or contradicted and that the Alliance stands by its commitments. He added that the commitments contained in the 8 December 1998 statement were also reaffirmed in the CFE Final Act in Istanbul. Neighbour also drew attention to paragraphs 9 and 10 of the 8 December 1998 NAC Statement on CFE pointing out that the U.S. and its Allies continue to honor the commitments in these paragraphs. Neighbour stated that the Alliance has kept its CFE Final Act commitments and urged all others to do the same, in full, including those regarding host nation consent.

¶6. (SBU) The U.K. (Gare) and the Netherlands (Kleinjan) also voiced their support for the U.S. and German interventions. Gare reminded all that the 28 March NAC Statement added to the three documents referred to by Germany. Kleinjan noted that all Allies, including those who have joined after the statements were made, stand by the statements.

¶7. (SBU) Russia (Ulyanov) thanked Allies for the clarification of continued support on previous NAC statements, asserting that Germany, the UK, the U.S., and Netherlands spoke on behalf of all Allies. In particular, Ulyanov told the JCG that the Russia was satisfied with the Alliance's confirmation of its support of elements in paragraph 10 of the 8 December 1998 NAC Statement, and that Russia's concerns have been addressed.

¶8. (SBU) The Czech Republic (Reinhlova) recalled that the parallel actions package is currently on the table awaiting a response from Russia. The parallel actions package is the path out of the current CFE situation and that discussion of various elements couldn't go further until Russia agrees to the package. Reinhlova appealed to Russia to give a positive concrete response to the parallel actions package.

¶9. (SBU) Russia (Ulyanov) replied that there is a package of decisions made at the Sochi Summit and those decisions formed the basis of negotiations with US and consultations with others. He claimed that there were no expectations that Russia will come up with a proposal. He complained that while the parallel actions package had some positive aspects, but was not sufficient and does not cover all issues concerning the current crisis. Ulyanov pointed out that since the Madrid Ministerial there have only been two U.S - Russia bilateral meetings. He bemoaned that the dialogue has not been "intensive." Ulyanov offered to work with the Czech Republic on a bilateral level and asked all delegations to continue the dialogue in all forums to resolve the current situation.

- - - - -  
RUSSIA REFUSES MORE CFE INSPECTIONS  
- - - - -

¶10. (SBU) Hungary and Belgium announced the recent rejections by the Russian Federation of their requests to conduct (separate) CFE inspections. Belgium sent their inspection request on 19 May and Hungary sent their inspection request on 23 May. Hungary "deeply regretted" Russia's refusal and continue "suspension" of Treaty implementation. Belgium voiced its support for the parallel

actions package as a way out of the current impasse.  
(Comment: the Belgian delegation was very reluctant to make this statement, and after initially stating last week that it would not do so, make this basic statement after direction from capital. End comment).

¶11. (SBU) The Netherlands, the U.K., Germany, and the U.S. voiced support for Hungary and Belgium's statements. The U.S. (Neighbour) reminded Russia that its "suspension" had no legal basis and urged Russia to resume Treaty implementation. Russia called for enhanced contact between Washington and Moscow to continue discussion of the parallel actions package as this was the only way for inspections to resume. Ulyanov opined that if the U.S. were to accept Russia's proposal to use all possible avenues to enhance contacts between our capitals, then the prospect of moving forward on (resuming) inspections would be underway.

¶12. (SBU) As JCG Chairman, Italy proposed postponing the JCG meeting on June 24 (due to the HLTF meeting) to Friday, June 27. This was accepted.

- - - - -  
SHOW ME THE...BRIEF!  
- - - - -

¶13. (C) The Czech Republic chaired the JCG-T plus 4 on May 26. The focus of the discussion was on how to respond if Russia brought up elements of previous NAC statements on CFE for discussion. Allies reaffirmed their support for the 28 March 2008 NAC Statement on CFE as well as all commitments in previous NAC declarations. The group generally agreed to use this as basis for any response to Russia - to tell Russia that previous NATO commitments are still valid and that they support all previous NATO commitments.

¶14. (C) Some allies (Germany, Luxembourg, and Greece) expressed frustration at the slow pace of the activities in the JCG, but acknowledged that delegations must work within the guidance from their capitals and NATO. Luxembourg (Pilot) wants to be allowed to negotiate in the JCG and plans to urge the HLTF to agree to negotiation on the technical aspects of the term "substantial combat forces." Germany swiftly replied that this would not be accepted. He added that all Allies should attempt to convince Russia that the parallel actions package was the only way out of the current situation.

¶15. (C) As in previous JCG-T and JCG, however, Germany (Richter) continued to suggest that the JCG could somehow have substantive discussions. In the meantime, he offered to brief the JCG on the historical definitions of various CFE terminologies (e.g. headroom, temporary deployment, permanent stationing, and "substantial combat forces"). The U.S. and other delegations insisted, and Germany agreed, to allow Allies to preview the brief well in advance of any presentation in the JCG, including a full dry run in the JCG-T.

¶16. (U) The next JCG-T will be on June 2. The next JCG will be on June 3.  
FINLEY